REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7-11 and 14-21 and 38 are pending in this application. Claims 5, 6, 12, 13 and 22-37 were previously canceled. Independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 38, and dependent claim15 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-21 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-21 and 38 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner states:

Claims 1-4, 7, 8-11 and 14-21 and 38 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention

The independent claims require <u>reissuing</u> by said vendor server of said merchant content as a web page of said vendor server. However the specification as filed does not provide adequate support for the term "reissuing." nor provide a means to ascertain its scope.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-4, 7-11 and 14-21 and 38 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particulary point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner states:

The term "reissuing" is unclear and its scope is uncertain. For purpose of examination, "reissuing" will be interpreted as "reframing."

Appl. No. 09/616,714

Amdt. dated October 17, 2007

Reply to Office Action of July 17, 2007

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention that the specification does not provide adequate support for the claimed reissuing by said vendor server of said merchant content as a web page of said vendor server, or that the term "reissuing" is unclear or its scope uncertain. The term is used in the claims in its ordinary sense, i.e. "to issue again." An embodiment of the claimed "reissuing at said vendor computer system said merchant web page as a web page of said vendor computer system" is disclosed, for example, on pages 28 and 29 of the specification, which state:

The following includes example steps in processing a single HTTP request:

- User's browser 300 at the client computer 101 sends an HTTP request to the BrowserAgent 250 at the server 130;
- The Browser Agent 250 forwards the request to the ServerAgent 252;
- 3. The ServerAgent 252 sends the request to a merchant's server 131;
- The merchant's server 131 sends an HTML response (HTML page) to the ServerAgent 252;
- The HTML response from the merchants server 131 is sent to the Process Engine 254;
- The Process Engine 254 processes the HTML response by performing steps including:
 - 6.1. Parsing the HTML response;
 - Replacing all the HTML links on the HTML page so that the links are routed through the vendor computer system 130;
 - 6.3 Replacing all the HTML POST, GET requests to be routed through the vendor computer system 130:
 - 6.4 Using the information available in the MerchantDB 256 and making appropriate changes to the HTML:

81045.944 Page 11 of 15

- 6.5. Using the information available in the MemberDB 258, automating the process of placing an order, registering a user (member) with a merchant, etc.;
- The process Engine 254 then sends the modified HTML response back to the Browser Agent 250; and
- The Browser Agent 250 sends the modified HTML response back to the User's Browser 300 for display to the user at the client computer 101.

As disclosed in the above-cited portion of the specification, in the described embodiment, the ServerAgent 252 at the vendor computer system 130 receives and HTML page from the merchant server 131. The ServerAgent 252 at the vendor computer system 130 then sends that HTML page to the Process Engine 254 at the vendor computer system 130. The Process Engine 254 then modifies the HTML page by, *inter alia*, replacing all HTML links to the merchant server 131 with links to the vendor computer system 130 and replacing all HTML POST and GET requests to the merchant server 131 with HTML POST and GET requests to the vendor computer system 130 sends the modified HTML page to the Browser Agent 250 at the vendor computer system 130. The Browser Agent 250 at the vendor computer system then sends the modified HTML page to the client computer 101. Hence, the original HTML page from the merchant computer 131 is "reissued" as a modified HTML page from the vendor computer system 130.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 38 to clarify that the claimed "reissuing" of the merchant web page by said vendor computer system means that the vendor computer system modifies the merchant web page by replacing hypertext links to the merchant computer system in the merchant web page with hypertext links to

Page 12 of 15

the vendor computer system in the modified web page, and then sends the modified web page from the vendor computer system to the client computer system. Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 38, as amended, and hence their respective dependent claims, are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, and respectfully requests that the Examiners objections under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-21 and 38 Based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-21, and 38 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,263,317 ("Sharp") in view of U.S. Patent 6,141,666 ("Tobin"). In making those rejections, the Examiner incorrectly interpreted the claim term "reissuing" as "reframing," and based the rejections of claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-21, and 38 on that incorrect interpretation (see page 4, lines 7-8 and page 7, lines 8-9 of the Office Action). The Examiner did not determine whether the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teaches or renders obvious the claim under the correct interpretation of the claim term "reissuing."

Independent Claims 1, 8, 17 and 38

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 38 to unambiguously state that in the claimed invention, the vendor computer system receives a merchant web page from a merchant computer system, the vendor computer system modifies the merchant web page by replacing hyper text links to the merchant computer system in the merchant web page with hyper text links to the vendor computer system in the modified

Appl. No. 09/616,714

Amdt. dated October 17, 2007

Reply to Office Action of July 17, 2007

web page, and the vendor computer system then sends the modified web page to the client computer. Applicant has carefully reviewed Tobin and Sharp, and has found nothing in either reference that alone, or in combination with the other reference or with the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, discloses or suggests that a vendor computer system modify a merchant web page received from a merchant computer system by replacing hypertext links to the merchant computer system in the merchant web page with hypertext links to the vendor computer system in the modified web page, and then send the modified web page to the client computer. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 38, as amended, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record, and respectfully requests that independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 38, as amended, be allowed.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 7, 9-11, 14-16, and 18-21

Claims 2-4, 7, 9-11, 14-16, and 18-21, being dependent upon allowable base claims, are themselves allowable for at least the same reasons provided with respect to independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 38 above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that dependent claims 2-4, 7, 9-11, 14-16, and 18-21 be allowed.

Appl. No. 09/616,714

Amdt. dated October 17, 2007

Reply to Office Action of July 17, 2007

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that pending claims 1-4, 7-

11, 14-21 and 38 are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-

21 and 38 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

THE HECKER LAW GROUP

Date: October 17, 2007

Frank Weyer Reg. No. 33,050

THE HECKER LAW GROUP, PLC

1925 Century Park East

Suite 2300

81045.944

Los Angeles, California 90067

(310) 286-0377 (voice)

(310) 286-0488 (fax)